

**Remarks/Arguments:**

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 15-16, 20-22, 24, 26-28 and 34 have been amended. Claims 1, 15-31 and 33-34 are currently pending in this application.

Claims 1, 15-31 and 33-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (USPN: 7,432,948) in view of Panian (USPN: 6,285,890) for the reasons contained in paragraphs 3 on pages 4-13 of the office action.

The Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by Examiner Amy Hsu and Primary Examiner Nhan Tran for conducting a personal interview with the Applicants' representative on June 16, 2009 at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. During the personal interview, a proposed amendment of claim 1 was presented along with arguments distinguishing such amended claim 1 over the prior art relied upon by the Examiner.

As reflected on the Interview Summary form, agreement was reached that Applicants proposed amendment overcomes the prior art rejection. Provided next is the substance of the interview.

**Substance of the Interview**

During the personal interview, it was argued that the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest a slave apparatus comprising a communication control unit operable to select a communication mode from a plurality of communication modes and that the slave apparatus transmits to a master device a notification code for notifying the communication mode presently selected by the communication control unit, as recited in the proposed amendment of claim 1. According to one of the exemplary embodiments, a digital camera 110 (e.g., slave apparatus) allows the selection of a mode from a plurality of modes and then transmits a notification code to an external device 300 (e.g., master device) to notify the communication mode

presently selected by the digital camera (e.g., slave apparatus) [see page 18 (line 19) – page 20 (line 9) and Figs. 2, 4 & 5].

On the other hand, the Watanabe reference discloses a personal computer 90 (master) which issues to a digital camera 10 (slave) a command to acquire the communication ID and then acquires it from the digital camera 10 [column 9 (lines 31-34 and 46-49)]. If the acquired ID has been registered with the personal computer 90, the personal computer 90 (master) issues to the digital camera 10 (slave) "an image transmission command" (for "file transmission mode") or "a command for activating the shooting function of the digital camera 10" (for "shooting mode") [column 9 (lines 34-38 and lines 49-52)].

Accordingly, unlike the proposed amendment of claim 1, the Watanabe reference discloses that communication between the digital camera 10 (slave) and the personal computer 90 (master) is established by the digital camera 10 executing the commands issued from the personal computer 90. That is, the communication mode is selected by (the command issued from) the master device-side, not by the slave apparatus side.

It is noted that the Panian reference fails to disclose or suggest the above shortcomings of the Watanabe reference. That is, the Panian reference also fails to disclose or suggest a slave apparatus comprising a communication control unit operable to select a communication mode from a plurality of communication modes and that the slave apparatus transmits to a master device a notification code for notifying the communication mode presently selected by the communication control unit, as recited in the proposed amendment of claim 1.

Due to the fact that agreement was reached during the personal interview that Applicants proposed amendment of claim 1 overcomes the prior art rejection, by this amendment claim 1 has been amended as proposed during the personal interview. It is noted that each of claims 15-16, 26-28 and 34, while not identical to claim 1, have also been amended to include features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 15-16, 26-28 and 34, as well as claims 17-25 and 29-33 dependent therefrom, clearly are allowable for at least the reasons mentioned above.

Moreover, it was submitted during the personal interview that the prior art also fails to disclose or suggest the feature that when a command in response to a notification code is not received by the slave apparatus from the master device within a predetermined time, the communication controlling unit electrically releases connection to the master device temporarily and then restores the connection, and by the time when the slave apparatus and the master device resume communication as a result of the restoration of connection, the communication controlling unit selects a communication mode from the plurality of communication modes so that its presently set-up communication mode is changed to a different communication mode from that used immediately before the release, as particularly recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claims 15, 26, 27 and 34.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is clearly allowable and the Examiner is kindly requested to promptly pass this case to issuance.

In the event, however, that the Examiner has any comments or suggestion of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the Applicant's representatives to expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738  
Attorney for Applicant

JLE/dmw

Dated: June 30, 2009

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

SO\_433136